

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 remain in the present application. New Claims 14-20 have been added. Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the amended claims and in view of the arguments set forth below.

Specification objections

Applicant has herein amended the specification (e.g., page 3, line 18) to correct the cited informality.

35 U.S.C. Section 102 rejections

Paragraph 2 and 3 of the above referenced Office Action states that independent Claims 1 and 7 are rejected as being anticipated by Gupta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,389,532). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to recite blocking transmission of a content file when the content file comprises a restricted data format. The amended claims recite examining the content file to determine whether the content file includes the digital signature, transmitting the content file when the content file includes the digital signature, blocking transmission of the content file when the digital signature is not included, and blocking transmission when the content file comprises a restricted data format. Thus, in addition to checking for the presence of a valid digital signature, the content file

is examined to determine whether it is a restricted data format. If so, transmission is blocked.

Applicant points out that the present invention as recited in Claims 1 and 7 is not shown by Gupta. Gupta recites a method and apparatus for filtering packets using digital signatures included there with (e.g., in a "packet header"). Applicant finds no disclosure regarding any testing to determine whether the packet is a restricted type of data format (e.g., MP3, MPEG, etc.). Accordingly, the claimed invention as recited in Claims 1-6 and Claims 7-13 is not anticipated by Gupta within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. Section 102.

35 U.S.C. Section 103 rejections

Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the above referenced Office Action states that Claims 3, 4, 6, 8-11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 as being unpatentable over Gupta in view of Gibbs et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,321). Applicant respectfully traverses.

For the rationale described above, Applicant asserts that Gupta does not show the claimed invention as recited in amended independent Claims 1 and 7. This defect is not remedied by the inclusion of Gibbs.

Paragraph 4 of the above referenced Office Action states that Gibbs shows aspects of the present invention where the restricted data format is an MP3 data format, an MPEG video format, or a Word Document format. Applicant finds no

description in the cited section of Gibbs (e.g., col. 6, lines 59-61) regarding the content file being examined to determine whether it is a restricted data format, and blocking the transmission if the content file is a restricted data format. Applicant understands the description in the cited section of Gibbs as merely a recitation of the type of "outbound media" which is transmitted to the remote user. This is completely different than the actions explicitly recited in the steps of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the Gupta and Gibbs combination does not show or suggest the claimed invention as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 7. Thus, the claimed invention as recited in Claims 1-6 and Claims 7-13 is not rendered unpatentable by the cited combination within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. Section 103.

New Claims 14-20

New Claims 14-20 have been added herein. New Claims 14-16 depend from Claim 1. New independent Claim 17 includes limitations regarding the blocking of transmission when the content file comprises a restricted data format. Thus, for the rationale described above, new Claims 14-20 are allowable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully asserts that all claims (Claims 1-20) are now in condition for allowance and Applicant earnestly solicits such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 1/9, 2004



Glenn Barnes
Registration No. 42,293

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060